Eight

Assimilation

On the topic of immigrant assimilation, perceptions often take precedence over facts. Two perceptions are perhaps most important: (1) the belief previous immigrants were better than today's immigrants, and (2) the sense that the new immigrants will bring about unwanted change.

In her examination of more than a century's worth of newspaper coverage of immigration, American University professor Rita Simon discovered both overly optimistic evaluations of earlier waves of immigrants and excessively pessimistic views of current immigrants and their ability to adapt to life in the United States. According to Simon:

> In my study of public attitudes toward immigration, going back as far as one can, I have found that the American people, although they refer to the United States very proudly as a country of immigrants and they talk about the immigrant heritage and so forth, when you ask them specifically about immigration and about how many immigrants should be allowed to enter the country, they tend to put on rose-colored glasses and look backwards and suggest that those immigrants who came earlier, they were wonderful for this country. . . . But the immigrants who are coming now—and the now could be in the 1940s, the 1950s or any decade up until right now—they're no good for this country. They take more than they give. They're not really loyal. They're coming here only to make money. They will not make positive contributions. And we should really, as much as possible, not allow them in.[1]

Simon adds, "One of the reasons that we see the pattern that I described about liking immigrants who came in the past and being fearful of those who are coming now is there's genuinely a fear of change. And somehow I think there's a fear that these people are different, that they will not behave as all previous groups have behaved."[2]

Copyright 2010. Greenwood.
All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE
AN: 331901 ; Stuart Anderson.; Immigration
Account: s6280395.main.ehost

Research by David Card (University of California–Berkeley) and his colleagues Ian Preston and Christian Dustmann of University College London supports Simon's evaluation. The research found people's attitudes toward immigration were much more likely to be shaped by their perception of "compositional amenities" than any impact, real or alleged, immigrants might have on jobs or wages.

Card defines "compositional amenities" as "The set of characteristics of an individual's environment that he or she values, and perceives as being potentially affected by a change in the presence of immigrants. It would include the racial/ethnic and income distribution of neighbors and coworkers, their religious affiliations, their language and culture."[3]

In Card's views, these perceptions go beyond what people may see around them. "That is extremely broad, because my feeling is that someone living in Tennessee, for example, may be concerned about the use of Spanish by immigrants in Miami. People often act like they have some feeling of 'ownership' over very wide domains. We don't have an easy way to make sense of this in economics other than as saying that it is something people obviously value."[4] He points out that he is often surprised at how someone from another state will comment forcefully on something that is going on (or believe is going on) at Berkeley.

By one measure, the research found "concerns over compositional amenities are roughly 4 times more important in explaining the variation in opinions on immigration policy within demographic subgroups than concerns over economic issues."[5] The study utilized data for 21 countries in the 2002 European Social Survey, but Card said, "I think the same ideas would apply in the U.S., perhaps to a slightly different extent."[6]

One reason for these results is that perceptions about immigrants in the minds of many people are different from the data. Many Americans may believe recent immigrants and their children are not interested in learning English, come here to get welfare benefits, are perhaps not that patriotic, and commit a disproportionate percentage of the crimes. The information in this chapter will help explain why these worries and perceptions are unnecessary.

DO IMMIGRANTS ASSIMILATE?

Do immigrants assimilate or stay forever apart from American society? This is a central question in the debate over immigration and has remained so for most of our nation's history. Discussing the restrictions on immigration imposed by Congress in the 1920s, historian Oscar Handlin wrote, "The objections to further immigration from Italy and Poland reflected the objectors' unfavorable observations of the Italians and the Poles they saw about them. The arguments that Greeks and Slovaks could not become

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

good Americans rested on the premise that the Greeks and Slovaks in the United States had not become good Americans."[7]

When attempting to measure whether immigrants are assimilating, one should use longitudinal data, not averages or "snapshots," notes Jason Riley, author of *Let Them In.*[8] The reason is that new people added to a group tend to skew the data, which masks progress made over time by earlier members of a group.

Here is an example of a longitudinal approach (tracking individuals) vs. a group "snapshot" approach: Let's assume that the height of a typical 9th-grade boy entering a high school is 5′ 6″ but that the typical 12th-grade boy's height is 6′. If we tracked individual boys or even a cohort of 9th graders through to 12th grade, then we would find that typically the boys grow 6 inches taller over the course of their time at the high school. But if one measured only the average height of the boys in the school at a given time, it might be only 5′10″ tall. And if one measured the average height at the school three years later, it would likely still be 5′10″. However, one would not say, "None of the boys at this school ever grow."

Another element that can skew data on assimilation is the inclusion of illegal immigrants, particularly short-term migrants. An individual who expects only to be in the United States at most two to four years has less of an incentive to invest in the time, energy, or resources to acquire skills that would aid a long-term resident, such as learning English proficiently or going back to school to gain a higher level of education.

The issue is not academic, since sometimes data that include illegal immigrants have been cited to argue for changes to the legal immigration system. Generally speaking, critics of legal immigration want illegal immigrants to be deported, not to take civics classes, so including data on illegal immigrants when discussing potential changes to legal immigration makes little sense.

WAGE GROWTH

One way to tell whether immigrants assimilate or not is to answer the following question: Do immigrants enter the United States and never increase their earnings beyond their initial wages? If the answer is "yes," then immigrants are not able to assimilate economically in the United States. But the literature shows immigrants increase their earnings over time.

While much has been written about what American institutions may do that interferes with assimilation, few commentators note what America does right. Perhaps the most important assimilation policy the United States can maintain is flexible labor markets. Inflexible labor markets, such as in France, mean an employer may not wish to take a chance on hiring a new

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

employee if it later will be difficult to dismiss that individual. The difficulty of young people or new immigrants entering the labor market because employers incur substantial risk of not being able to dismiss a new employee may be a contributing factor in the disaffection of Muslim immigrants in France and some other European countries. The world is complex, and one factor cannot explain everything. However, a government's economic policies are often a good place to start when looking for answers.

At least currently, the United States maintains a relatively flexible labor market when compared to most other countries. "Wages are less rigid in Canada and the United States than in Australia, with the general consensus that the U.S. labor market is the most flexible of the three," explain economists Heather Antecol (Claremont McKenna College), Peter Kuhn (University of California–Santa Barbara), and Stephen J. Trejo (University of Texas–Austin).[9]

Wage flexibility in America directly contributes to assimilation. "We find that wage assimilation is an important source of immigrants' earnings growth in both Canada and the United States, but the magnitude of wage assimilation is substantially larger in the United States," according to Antecol, Kuhn, and Trejo.[10] They found Australia offering unemployment compensation to newly arriving immigrants and rigidity in the labor market encouraged new immigrants to Australia to "invest less in skills that foster wage growth than immigrants to the United States."[11] Antecol, Kuhn, and Trejo conclude, "Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that national labor market institutions—in particular those that influence the dispersion of wage and the incomes of the unemployed—can play a key role in the immigrant assimilation process."[12]

Jeffrey S. Passel, senior research associate, Pew Hispanic Center, has developed techniques to differentiate between legal and illegal immigrants in census data and to track changes based on years in the country. Passel's research on immigrant wage growth and other issues demonstrates how important it can be to determine immigrant legal status when examining data on assimilation.

Census data show legal immigrants experience significant wage gains over time, even surpassing the average family income of natives, in the case of naturalized citizens. But illegal immigrants do not show that type of income gain based on years in the United States. "Average family income for both legal immigrants and refugees in the U.S. for more than 10 years is only 2 to 3 percent below that of natives," writes Passel. "For longer term naturalized citizen families, average family income is 23 percent higher than native income."[13] But the average income level of an illegal immigrant family remains well below the average native family (about 35 percent below) even among illegal immigrants in the country 10 years or longer.[14]

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Research that did not distinguish between legal and illegal immigrants still found significant wage growth among immigrants. Economists Harriet Duleep and Mark Regets found that after a decade in the United States, the earnings gap between new immigrants and natives largely disappears, with immigrant wage growth faster than native (6.7 percent vs. 4.4 percent).[15]

EDUCATION

We can see a similar story on legal immigrants in the Pew Hispanic Center's analysis of census data on education and immigrants. Overall, 32 percent of legal immigrants have obtained a bachelor's degree or higher, compared to 30 percent of natives and 15 percent of illegal immigrants.[16]

What about those who did not finish high school (ages 18–24)? Among illegal immigrants, 49 percent did not graduate high school, compared to 21 percent of legal immigrants and 11 percent of natives. Even among illegal immigrants who completed high school, less than half went on to attend college.[17]

In contrast, among immigrants and natives who have completed high school, more legal immigrants have gone on to attend a college than natives—73 percent of legal immigrants vs. 70 percent of natives—according to Passel's research.[18] There may be legal impediments, such as denial of in-state tuition or lack of access to student loans, that can hinder illegal immigrants from pursuing college in the United States.

Education levels for legal immigrants improve across generations, just as they have historically for Americans. It is likely most people reading this chapter who have a college degree had parents or grandparents who did not attend college. "Turning to the data, educational assimilation appears alive and well," according to Pia Orrenius, senior economist, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. "High school dropout rates for immigrants improve across generations, dropping from 27 percent in the first generation to below the native average of 8.9 percent in the third generation."[19]

Orrenius finds "large differences among groups of immigrants," noting non-Hispanic immigrants, as a group, start below the dropout rates for natives and then improve further in the second generation. "Hispanic immigrants do much worse in general, but also improve the most," notes Orrenius. "In the first generation, about 44 percent lack a high school diploma, this rate improves to 15 and 16 percent, respectively, in the second and third generations."[20] She finds a similar pattern with wages, but points out an "education gap" explains most of the wage difference.

Some of this gap may be explained from Passel's data about the difference in education levels (and improvements) among illegal immigrants compared to legal immigrants, which Orrenius does not distinguish between, except in

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

discussing possible solutions. "Legal status could open many doors, both lowering the costs of education and increasing avenues for financing education through access to student loans," she writes.[21] But Orrenius notes, "Surveys suggest that Hispanics have lower educational aspirations than other ethnic groups. This could reflect a discouraged youth to whom economic opportunity may not seem within reach. In addition, ethnicity does matter. Even when researchers account for all measurable factors that determine education levels, the fact that an individual is Hispanic or Black or Asian matters in and of itself."[22]

As with many immigration issues, the question turns back to Mexico. "Worrying about immigrant assimilation boils down to worrying about Mexican immigration," writes Orrenius. "Non-Hispanic immigrants consistently out perform natives, even after three generations."[23]

Two key points help place these concerns about Mexican immigrants in context. First, immigrants from Mexico represented only 17 percent of all legal immigrants to the United States in 2008, a smaller proportion than most people would imagine.[24] Second, according to the data, assimilation still works. Orrenius concludes the melting pot "continues to simmer successfully, much as it did 100 years ago." She makes a broader point, one that goes beyond immigration policy: "The problem we have uncovered is not one of immigrant assimilation, but rather what immigrants are assimilating to."[25]

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Do immigrants and their children learn English? Do they want to learn English? Confronted with store signs in Spanish and service workers with sometimes limited English skills, many Americans believe the answer is "no." The data suggest otherwise.

In the report *The New Americans*, produced by the National Research Council, only 3 percent of immigrants in the country 30 years or more reported not speaking English well in the 1990 Census.[26] This illustrates that assimilation takes place, but also how important it is to make judgments on data that are longitudinal, since newly arriving immigrants can skew the totals.[27] The story is quite positive with the children of immigrants. According to a Pew survey, 88 percent of second-generation children from Latino immigrant families and 94 percent from the third generation said they spoke English very well.[28]

Contrary to concerns that Spanish-speaking immigrants will pass along to their children and grandchildren a proclivity to speak Spanish over English, research shows the opposite is true. A study by Frank Bean and Ruben Rumbaut (both University of California–Irvine) and Douglas Massey (Princeton University) found, "Although the generational life expectancy of

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Spanish is greater among Mexicans in Southern California than other groups, its demise is all but assured by the third generation."[29]

Bean, Rumbaut, and Massey concluded, "Based on an analysis of language loss over the generations, the study concludes that English has never been seriously threatened as the dominant language in America, nor is it under threat today."[30]

IMMIGRANTS AND CRIME

Historically, no issue can incite a population against a minority or foreign-born group more than allegations of criminal activities. Pogroms against Jews in Russia, lynchings against black Americans in the antebellum South, and violence against Chinese immigrants in the West were at times triggered by accusations of criminal offences. Needless to say, public perception has often trumped reality.

In this case, the good news is that data show immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than the native born. In fact, data from California show immigrants are much less likely to do so "When we consider all institutionalization (not only prisons but also jails, halfway houses, and the like) and focus on the population that is most likely to be in institutions because of criminal activity (men 18–40), we find that, in California, U.S.-born men have an institutionalization rate that is 10 times higher than that of foreign-born men (4.2 percent vs. 0.42 percent). And when we compare foreign-born men to U.S.-born men with similar age and education levels, these differences become even greater," according to research by economists Kristin F. Butcher (Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago) and Anne Morrison Piehl (Rutgers University and the National Bureau of Economic Research). Looking only at prisons the researchers found, "U.S.-born adult men are incarcerated at a rate over two-and-a-half times greater than that of foreign-born men."[31]

National studies reach the same conclusion: foreign born (both legal and illegal immigrants) are less likely to commit crimes than the native born. "Among men age 18–39 (who comprise the vast majority of the prison population), the 3.5 percent incarceration rate of the native-born in 2000 was 5 times higher than the 0.7 percent incarceration rate of the foreign-born."[32] However, one of the ironies is that "assimilation" in the area of criminal behavior has actually meant a higher incarceration rate of native-born Hispanic males than their foreign-born counterparts, again raising the question into what societal problems are the children of immigrants assimilating.[33]

To those who have examined the issue, it is not surprising the crime rates of immigrants are low. "Currently U.S. immigration policy provides several mechanisms that are likely to reduce the criminal activity of immigrants," write Butcher and Piehl. "Legal immigrants are screened with regard to their

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

criminal backgrounds. In addition, all non-citizens, even those in the United States legally, are subject to deportation if convicted of a criminal offense that is punishable by a prison sentence of a year or more, even if that is suspended. Furthermore, those in the country illegally have an additional incentive to avoid contact with law enforcement—even for minor offenses—since such contact is likely to increase the chances that their illegal status will be revealed."[34]

WELFARE USE

There is little evidence immigrants come to America to get on welfare, rather than to work, flee persecution, and/or join family members in the United States. Even if receiving services were a motive, it would make little sense because immigrants are generally ineligible for federal means-tested benefits programs unless they have been in the United States for five years or more in a lawful status. It should be noted that states have different eligibility rules and a child born in America is a U.S. citizen and can receive benefits if he or she meets a program's eligibility criteria, regardless of a parent's immigration status.

An analysis of census data released by the House Ways and Means Committee indicates the percentage of those who use AFDC/TANF (Aid to Families with Dependent Children/Temporary Assistance for Needy Children), Medicaid, and food stamps is generally about the same or lower for natives as it is for noncitizens and naturalized citizens. The data show the vast majority of immigrants are not receiving these types of public benefits. For example, less than one percent of naturalized citizens and noncitizens in 2006 received benefits under TANF (see Table 8.1).[35]

In 2006, 0.6 percent of natives used AFDC/TANF, compared to 0.3 percent of naturalized citizens and 0.7 percent for noncitizens. For Medicaid, 13.1 percent of natives used Medicaid, compared to 10.8 percent of naturalized citizens and 11.6 percent of noncitizens. And 7.7 percent of natives

TABLE 8.1
Use of Public Benefits by Nativity and Citizenship, 2006

Program	Percent of Natives Using Benefit	Percent of Naturalized Citizens Using Benefit	Percent of Non-Citizens Using Benefit
AFDC/TANF	0.6%	0.3%	0.7%
SSI	1.6%	3.0%	1.3%
Medicaid	13.1%	10.8%	11.6%
Food Stamps	7.7%	3.9%	6.2%

Source: House Ways and Means Committee, *2008 Green Book*, Appendix H, Table H-9—Estimated Benefit Usage by Citizenship Categories: 1995, 1999, 2001, 2006.

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

used the food stamp program, compared to 3.9 percent of naturalized citizens and 6.2 percent of noncitizens. For SSI (Supplemental Security Income), which most older natives would not use because they are eligible for Social Security benefits, 1.6 percent of natives used SSI in 2006, compared to 3.0 percent of naturalized citizens and 1.3 percent of noncitizens.

In 1996, Congress tightened the rules for immigrant benefit eligibility as part of a broader reform of the nation's welfare laws. The data illustrate this decrease in immigrant welfare use. "There were substantial declines between 1994 and 1999 in legal immigrants' use of all major benefit programs: TANF (−60 percent), food stamps (−48 percent), SSI (−32 percent), and Medicaid (−15 percent)," according to a report by the Urban Institute.[36]

Even before the changes in the law, there was little support for the view that individual immigrants were more likely to be on welfare than natives.[37] One of the difficulties in measuring welfare use is that eligibility for some benefits is geared toward individuals and for others is based on family, and families may live in households that go beyond two spouses and their children. If one labels a household as "using welfare" even when only one person in a house is receiving benefits, then it is likely to inflate the data on welfare use for immigrants, since the foreign born tend to maintain larger households. On the other hand, such a calculation could capture data on a U.S.-citizen child born to immigrant parents.

If immigrants are seeking out states with more lenient benefit eligibility, then they're not doing a good job. Many states with recent large increases in their immigrant populations are primarily states with low and below average social spending, such as Arkansas, North Carolina, South Carolina, Utah, and Georgia, notes Jason Riley.[38]

Prior to the 1996 reforms, there was concern that noncitizen parents were making excessive use of SSI. With the exception of refugees and other "humanitarian immigrants," veterans, active duty military and their families, and certain Native Americans born abroad, Congress enacted a complete ban on SSI for noncitizens who enter the United States after August 22, 1996.[39] Lawful permanent residents with credit for 40 quarters of work history in the United States can receive SSI once they have been in "qualified" status for five years or more (see Table 8.2).

In 1995, 3.2 percent of noncitizens used SSI, compared to 1.3 percent in 2006. Similarly, Congress barred most noncitizens arriving after August 22, 1996, from using food stamps, although this was modified in 2002 to allow noncitizen children and certain other lawfully residing immigrants to use food stamps. In general, a sponsor of an immigrant can be "required to reimburse the government for any means-tested public benefit the alien has received," notes attorney Susan Fortino-Brown.[40]

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

TABLE 8.2
Benefits Eligibility for Lawful Permanent Residents (LPRs)

Program	Eligibility for Immigrants Who Arrived after August 22, 1996
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	Not eligible until after 5 years or more of lawful permanent residence status; deeming of sponsor's income and resources could affect eligibility
Food Stamps	Not eligible until after 5 years or more of lawful permanent residence status; lawful permanent residents who have worked for 40 quarters; deeming of sponsor's income and resources could affect eligibility; children under age 18 are eligible
Supplemental Security Income	Generally ineligible. Lawful permanent residents with credit for 40 quarters of work history eligible after 5 years in legal (resident) status; deeming of sponsor's income and resources could affect eligibility
Medicaid (Full-Scope)	Not eligible until after 5 years or more of lawful permanent residence status; deeming of sponsor's income and resources could affect eligibility; state options on children under 21 and pregnant women
Children's Health Insurance Program	Not eligible until after 5 years or more of lawful permanent residence status; deeming of sponsor's income and resources could affect eligibility; state options on children under 21 and pregnant women

Source: National Immigration Law Center. Rules as of January 2010. Note: Eligibility rules differ for immigrants who arrived in the United States prior to August 22, 1996, refugees, asylees, individuals granted withholding of deportation, Cuban/Haitian entrants, victims of trafficking, members of the Armed Forces on active duty and honorably discharged veterans and spouses/children of military/veterans. State eligibility rules can differ. Immigrants are eligible for Emergency Medicaid, including labor and delivery, if otherwise eligible for the program. In some circumstances under the law immigrants may become eligible for a benefit prior to 5 years of law permanent resident status if, for example, they were in "qualified" immigrant status for 5 years, such as a qualified battered immigrant or certain individuals paroled into the country who later became permanent residents.

OPINION SURVEYS OF IMMIGRANTS

One way to judge whether immigrants hold views that show they are good members of American society is to ask them their opinions on a variety of matters. A 2009 survey found that 76 percent of immigrants agreed with the statement, "The United States is a unique country that stands for something special in the world."[41] The survey, conducted by Public Agenda, a nonpartisan research group, involved more than 1,000 immigrants.

In the Public Agenda survey, 87 percent of the noncitizens who are legal residents say "they are either in the process or planned to become citizens in the future."[42] Eighty-four percent said a reason for becoming a U.S. citizen was to "show a commitment and pride in being an American." Eighty-eight

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

percent cited "to have equal rights and protections in the United States" as reason for citizenship. And 90 percent cited attaining the right to vote.[43]

According to the survey, 88 percent of immigrants said it was extremely or somewhat important for immigrants "to work and stay off welfare." Eighty-four percent of immigrants believe it's somewhat or very hard for "new immigrants to get a good job or do well in the country without learning English."[44]

Overall, immigrants take a positive view of learning English. Seventy percent of those surveyed who spoke little or no English when arriving in America said they have taken classes to improve their English skills.[45]

On the issue of teaching English in public schools, 74 percent of immigrants said it was better to teach new immigrants English "as quickly as possible, even if this means they fall behind in other subjects." When parents were asked about how well their children (under 18) speak English, 67 percent said excellent, 21 percent good, 8 percent fair, and only 1 percent poor.

Eighty-eight percent of immigrants agreed with the statement, "A person has to work hard in this country to make it—nobody gives you anything for free."[46]

Although some have expressed the fear that Hispanics are less likely to share American values, public opinion surveys show this concern is unfounded. A 2004 American National Election Study found 91 percent of Hispanics said their love for America was "extremely" or "very" strong, the same percentage as whites.[47] In fact, a slightly higher percentage of Hispanics than whites—86 percent vs. 85 percent—said when they see "the American flag flying" it makes them feel "extremely good" or "very good."[48]

Supporting these survey results, Jason Riley of the *Wall Street Journal* points out those pushing what conservatives see as a "multicultural" agenda tend to be professors at elite universities, not "the women changing the linen at your hotel, or the men building homes in your neighborhood." His proposed solution: "Keep the immigrants. Deport the Columbia faculty."[49]

NOTES

1. Rita Simon interview, "The First Measured Century." Available at: http://www.pbs.org/fmc/interviews/simon.htm.
2. Ibid.
3. Interview with David Card.
4. Ibid.
5. David Card, Ian Preston, and Christian Dustmann, "Immigration, Wages, and Compositional Amenities," NBER Working Paper No. 15521 (November 2009): 2.
6. Interview with David Card.

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

7. As cited in "Should America Remain a Nation of Immigrants," hearing before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, August 11, 1997.

8. Interview with Jason Riley.

9. Heather Antecol, Peter Kuhn, and Stephen J. Trejo, "Assimilation via Prices or Quantities? Labor Market Institutions and Immigrant Earning Growth in Australia, Canada and the United States," IZA DP, no.802, June 2003, 1.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid., 2, 31–32.

12. Ibid., 32.

13. Jeffrey S. Passel, *Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics* (Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2005), 31.

14. Ibid., 31.

15. Harriet Orcutt Duleep and Mark C. Regets, "Immigrants and Human-Capital Investment," *American Economic Review* (May 1999).

16. Passel, 23.

17. Ibid., 22.

18. Ibid.

19. Pia Orrenius, "Immigrant Assimilation: Is the U.S. Still a Melting Pot?" Presentation, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, January 2004, 3.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 4.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. *2008 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics,* Office of Immigration Statistics, Department of Homeland Security, 2009. Table 3. Of 1,107,126 legal immigrants in 2008, 189,989 were born in Mexico.

25. Orrenius, 4.

26. National Research Council, *The New Americans*, advance copy (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1997), S-10.

27. Julia Preston, "Latino Immigrants' Children Found Grasping English," *New York Times*, November 30, 2007. For example, a Pew Hispanic Center survey found only 23 percent of first-generation Latino immigrants believed they spoke English well.

28. Ibid.

29. "Immigration No Threat to English Use in the U.S.: Study," Reuters, September 13, 2006.

30. Ibid.

31. Kristin F. Butcher and Anne Morrison Piehl, *Crime, Corrections, and California* (San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California, 2008), 1–2.

32. Ruben G. Rumbaut and Walter Ewing, *The Myth of Immigrant Criminality and the Paradox of Assimilation: Incarceration Rates among Native and Foreign-Born Men* (Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center, 2007), 1.

33. Ibid.

34. Butcher and Piehl, 3.

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

35. House Ways and Means Committee, *2008 Green Book*, Appendix H, Table H-9—Estimated Benefit Usage by Citizenship Categories: 1995, 1998, 2001, 2006.

36. Walter A. Ewing, *Not Getting What They Paid For* (Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center, 2003), 1.

37. In research for the Urban Institute in 1994, Rebecca L. Clark wrote, "Among immigrants, high rates of welfare use are limited to one group of immigrants—those who entered as refugees—and one type of welfare—SSI. For other types of welfare, immigrants who did not enter as refugees are no more likely to use welfare than natives." From Rebecca L. Clark, "The Costs of Providing Public Assistance and Education to Immigrants" (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1994), 18, as cited in Julian L. Simon, *Immigration: The Demographic and Economic Facts* (Washington, DC: Cato Institute and the National Immigration Forum, 1995), 35–36.

38. Jason Riley, *Let Them In* (New York: Gotham Books, 2008), 108.

39. Thank you to Jonathan Blazer and Tanya Broder of the National Immigration Law Center for their assistance.

40. Susan Fortino-Brown, "Family-Sponsored Immigration, in *Navigating the Fundamentals of Immigration Law: Guidance and Tips for Successful Practice, 2007–2008 Edition*, ed. Grace E. Akers (Washington, DC: American Immigration Lawyers Association, 2007), 326.

41. *A Place to Call Home: What Immigrants Say Now About Life in America* (New York: Public Agenda and Carnegie Corporation, 2009), 15.

42. Ibid. 24.

43. Ibid., 26.

44. Ibid., 50–51.

45. Ibid., 52.

46. Ibid., 64.

47. As cited in Lack Citrin, Amy Lerman, Michael Murakami and Kathryn Pearson, "Testing Huntington: Is Hispanic Immigration a Threat to America Identity?" *Perspectives on Politics*, March 2007, 43.

48. Ibid.

49. Riley, 156.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Butcher, Kristin F., and Anne Morrison Piehl. *Crime, Corrections, and California.* San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California, 2008.

Orrenius, Pia. "Immigrant Assimilation: Is the U.S. Still a Melting Pot?" Presentation, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, January 2004.

Passel, Jeffrey S. *Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, 2005.

A Place to Call Home: What Immigrants Say Now about Life in America. New York: Public Agenda and Carnegie Corporation, 2009.

Rumbaut, Ruben G., and Walter Ewing. *The Myth of Immigrant Criminality and the Paradox of Assimilation: Incarceration Rates among Native and Foreign-Born Men.* Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center, 2007.

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

This page intentionally left blank

EBSCOhost - printed on 10/1/2023 10:10 PM via MERCED COMMUNITY COLLEGE. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use